

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-12 and 14-21 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 12, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claim 13 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided at paragraph [003] of the Specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claim 12 is hereby amended, thereby obviating the informality issue.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-11 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 2000-196720 (hereinafter merely “the ‘720 patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,443<sup>1</sup> to Opela et al. (hereinafter merely “Opela”), further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter merely “AAPA”), Japanese Patent No. JP10-312334 (hereinafter merely “the ‘334

patent”), U.S. Patent No. US6,850,784 to SanGiovanni (hereinafter merely “SanGiovanni”), and Japanese Patent No. JP 2002-9907 (hereinafter merely “the ‘907 patent”).

Claims 12, and 14-21 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP2001-169166 (hereinafter merely “the ‘166 patent”) in view of Opela, further in view of the ‘907 patent, the ‘334 patent, Japanese Patent No. JP2000-69159 (hereinafter merely “the ‘159 patent”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,701,162 to Everett (hereinafter merely “Everett”).

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Independent claim 1, recites *inter alia*:

“A portable display apparatus comprising:

**...wherein the cover is temporarily tightened upon rotation of the cover approximately 90 degrees around the first axis,**

**wherein the main body has a depression formed therein, the depression adapted to support at least one button such that the at least one button does not protrude from the main body and such that the at least one button is covered by the cover when the cover is in a closed position and such that the at least one button is used to change or select information displayed on the display panel.**” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Office Action relies on Opela to reject the claimed features of “wherein the main body has a depression formed therein, the depression adapted to support at least one button such that the at least one button does not protrude from the main body and such that the at least one button is covered by the cover when the cover is in a closed position and such that the at least one button is used to change or select information displayed on

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants submit that the Office Action indicted a different patent number for Opela. Applicants assume the Office Action intended U.S. Patent No. 7,039,443 to Opela as a basis of rejection.

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP  
745 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10151

212-588-0800

the display panel”, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added, see Office Action, page 3, lines 12-22, page 4, lines 1-4, page 7, lines 1-14). Opela discloses that “the internal user interface 116 includes a scroll key 501 that serves as the external user interface 115 when accessed through a matching key on the surface of housing 129” (emphasis added, column 8, lines 33-36, Figure 4, Figure 5). As understood by Applicants, Opela’s “scroll key 501” needs to protrude from “the internal user interface 116” so that “the matching key 501” has access to the “scroll key 501”. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Opela’s key 501 is covered by the external interface 115 in contrast with Applicants’ button covered by the cover. Applicants submit that Opela’s “external user interface” and Applicants’ “cover” are different matters. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of Opela does not disclose or suggest the above-identified features in claim 1.

Applicants submit that Opela does not disclose or suggest the above-identified features in claim 1. Applicants submit that the prior art relied upon does not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

In addition, Applicants submit that the prior art relied upon does not teach or suggest that “wherein the cover is temporarily tightened upon rotation of the cover approximately 90 degrees around the first axis”, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 12 recites similar, or somewhat similar, features and is patentable for similar reasons.

#### IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
Tel. (212) 588-0800